

annual budget was supplied by the private sector. [TC]2 expects at least 55 percent of its 2007 funding to be provided by the private sector. To date, the public investment alone in [TC]2 has produced technology advancement valued in excess of \$375 million, a return of more than 400 percent.

These programs do not specifically benefit any particular congressional district. They are an important element of our national textile industry which once led the world but, as has been noted, is now struggling to keep pace.

The textile industry needs these programs and our support, which have proven to be a wise investment in the past. This is why this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I think we come to the floor not because we feel like Mr. FLAKE's amendment is likely to pass, but he provides a unique opportunity for us to talk to each other and the American people about some of the problems and stresses that are taking place in our country. There are three points that I want to make.

First of all, this is not a local issue for me. The appropriation, the consortium, is of eight leading textile research universities in Alabama, California, Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and South Carolina. Not one of those universities is located in my congressional district. This is not a local pork barrel request for those of us who are rising.

Second, I want to make the point that Mr. COBLE and I, on a bipartisan basis, have been the co-Chairs of the furnishings caucus, which the textile industry provides a major base for in North Carolina and in other parts of the country. This is not something that's just about textiles. It is about a broader-based loss of jobs and employment opportunities and a severe impact on our economy and various economies in multiple States that goes well beyond just the textile industry. I hope Mr. FLAKE recognizes that.

□ 1130

The third point I want to make is a broader point, because it is raised by the gentleman from Arizona in a sequence of amendments. He has made the argument that somehow we are better off to let the Federal Government be making these decisions rather than trying to direct these appropriations through this process to local communities.

Now, that's an interesting argument for a person to be making who in most cases makes the counterargument that States rights are more important than

Federal rights. If anybody knows what the priorities ought to be in North Carolina, Massachusetts, Alabama, South Carolina, it should be the people who are representing those areas, and I would have to say Presidents, administrations, Democrat and Republican, have not paid sufficient attention to the plight of the textile industry, the furnishings industry, the loss of manufacturing jobs that we pay in our local communities.

So for somebody to make the argument that we shouldn't be involved in the process when the decisions that are being made are impacting our local communities, I don't understand, especially a gentleman who has consistently and long term supported the notion of States rights.

So I think this is an appropriate thing for us to be doing, not only in this amendment context, but in most of the contexts, in essentially all of the contexts. I even supported his Republican colleague's Christmas tree amendment because I thought he knew more about the Christmas tree industry in his local community than anybody was ever going to know on a national basis about the importance of Christmas trees to his local economy. These are things that we are uniquely situated to understand and advocate for, and I would hope that our colleagues would strongly and resoundingly defeat this amendment, for those three purposes and others.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Some people may have thought that since I have supported Mr. FLAKE on a number of amendments, that this was sort of a centrifuge way for me to help defeat the amendment because it might lose support, given the fact that I have supported some of his amendments and not supported others. But, rather, I did request an earmark. It is one of the seven or eight earmarks that have been combined together in this in support of the textile center because the textile center exists in about eight different locations around the country, eight institutions, one of them the University of California at Davis. That part of UC Davis which is part of this is actually not in my district. It's in the gentleman, Mr. THOMPSON's, district. But I am convinced of the worthiness of this request for a slightly different reason than has been mentioned on the floor to this time.

One of the key areas that the textile center funds go to support in the work and research that's done at the UC Davis center is in the area of personal protection, research improving the functional clothing for homeland security and occupational safety. What do we mean by that?

Well, there are what are known as biocidal Nomex fabrics, which have

been developed for firefighters, for first responders and for military personnel in collaboration with the National Personal Protective Technology Laboratory. In collaboration with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, research has enhanced the safety and comfort of firefighters' uniforms by improving and redesigning the fabrics and clothing. Biocidal textiles, and biocidal means that there is something that is in the textile itself, the product itself, which can kill certain kinds of things, substances which would be harmful to those who are wearing them. This is dedicated research for this specific purpose. Biocidal textiles, including protective masks, have been designed and developed for health care and other workers, resulting from interdisciplinary research teams, which include social and physical scientists, public health and environmental researchers.

So while there are many reasons to support this amendment from the standpoint of those that are attempting to help an industry that has had difficult times, I rise in support of the very specific research that's being done as part of the textile center operation at the University of California at Davis which goes to protecting those folks who respond as first responders when we have explosions, when we have fires. It is not just being said to come up with some extraordinary reason to support this. This is actual research being done that has produced products that has made it safer for our first responders.

One of the things I have requested from anybody who has asked me to put forth an earmark request is show me the Federal nexus. This to me is clearly a Federal nexus. This is research that supports first responders all over the country. It's concentrated research that means it is done on a far better basis than otherwise would be possible. It enhances the final product. And in that way, it seems to me, it is a substantial, reasonable application of Federal funds for a Federal purpose.

For that reason, even though I have great respect for the gentleman from Arizona, whom I think has done a great job, and I have referred to him publicly because of his pleasant demeanor as he approaches this difficult task as Don Quixote with couth, I still would have to say with all due respect, I must oppose his amendment.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Thank you.

For many of my colleagues this is just another earmark. For me this is somewhat personal because the first job that I ever held right out of high school before I went to college was in a textile plant. That was when they were plentiful in North Carolina and really